THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. IX.] BOSTON, DECEMBER, 1868. [No. 11.

EDITOR'S NOTES.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE.

To the Editor of "Monthly Journal."

YOUR pages are not the ones for a controversy; but I differ so much from your interpretation of the new article in the Constitution of the National Conference, that I would like a further explanation.

I know of nothing in that Constitution now which would exclude the society of Chinese Idolaters recently formed, the papers say, in Portland, Oregon. They do not come under the name of "Unitarian or other Christians;" they are not "Disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ;" they do not wish to devote themselves "to the service of God and the building-up of the kingdom of his Son." But if all these "declarations" simply express the opinion of the majority, and commit in no degree those who object to them, they do not form any constitutional barrier to the admission of the society referred to.

A constitution *must* bind all who meet under it, or it is no constitution at all. Therefore I think that while our debate was perfectly Christian, as you have shown in your November number, we stultified ourselves by passing the amendment which every "outside" paper I have seen understands differently from the "Monthly Journal."

I have no other wish in this communication, or in the sermon I published upon the subject, than to have the whole denomination stand publicly, where I believe most of us do privately, on the side of "Christ and his Church."

RICHARD METCALF.

WINCHESTER, MASS., Nov. 11, 1868.

We had hoped, after devoting so much space in the last number of the Journal to the consideration of the recent meeting of the National Conference, that we should have no more occasion to look back to that meeting, but only forward to the execution of the plans of action which were there commended. But respect for the source from which the above letter comes, together with the fact that, as appears from sundry publications, others share in one way or another the uncertainty or dissatisfaction which Mr. Metcalf expresses, make it necessary that we should add a few words to what we have already said.

We do not propose to go over again the ground covered by our remarks in the last Journal. In the present number we print, at the request of many, a verbatim report, as accurate as could be obtained, of the entire discussion on the proposed change in the Constitution; and we are willing to rest for a confirmation of the correctness of what we have said on a candid reading of this report.

In reply to Mr. Metcalf, we repeat that the action of the Conference, in adopting the amendment, does not in any wise affect the character of the Conference as a Christian body, which in its very name it is declared to be; but it only openly expresses that sacred regard for individual independence which is an inherent characteristic of our denomination, and which was already implied, and indeed distinctly stated, as an essential condition of the establishment of the Conference. As we stated in

the last number of our Journal, the sensitiveness on this point, which seemed at the meeting in New York to be as marked among the most conservative as among the most radical, is by no means a new feature in our denominational character. We have taken occasion to look over the articles written and the discussions held during the years just before and after the organization of the American Unitarian Association, and we find ample illustration of the emphasis which was then put upon this principle of individual liberty.

The "Christian Disciple" for January, 1822, says, "We hold to the principles of religious liberty in their utmost extent, and most unqualified character." — "No examination of the religious opinions of another for admission to our communion or fellowship, with whatever softening pretences it may be proposed, should ever be acquiesced in." — "Liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment should be guarded like the Pass of Thermopylæ, and in the spirit of those martyrs to political freedom who fell there." It would be easy enough to multiply quotations like these to show that the same principle, which, by so overwhelming a majority has just been avowed by our delegates at the Conference, has been held and acted on by our Unitarian denomination from the very beginning of its organization.

Furthermore, although not so distinctly avowed, this principle has been virtually assumed by other denominations; and when we consider their habitual exercise of it, it is a matter of surprise that they should unfavorably criticise the open statement of it by ours.

At the meeting of the Congregational National Council, in 1865,— an organization which very closely resembles in its character and purpose our National Conference, — a declaration of Faith was adopted, setting forth distinct

articles of belief, as embodying the sentiments of the Congregational Churches of America. Now it hardly needs reference to the discussion upon those articles to authorize the assertion that there was a very large minority whose views these articles did not, by any means, express. Yet these men retained their places in the Council, and shared in its proceedings, and probably felt themselves in no way compromised by this action of the Council. They regarded it as thoroughly understood (and it is only on this supposition that their course can be reconciled with honesty) that "all declarations of this Council are expressions only of its majority, committing in no degree those who object to them, and dependent wholly for their effect upon the consent they command on their own merits from the churches here represented or belonging within the circle of our fellowship." Believing, as we do, in the uprightness and integrity of the men who composed that Orthodox Council, we must say that the only difference, as regards this matter under consideration, between them and the members of our National Conference is, that they did not, and we did, consider it worth while and due to fairness, openly to assert the principle by which both alike were acting.

And now, in answer to the particular inquiry of Mr. Metcalf, as to whether, as it now stands, there is any thing in the Constitution of the National Conference that would exclude a society of Chinese Idolaters, we would only ask an examination of the Constitution itself. There the definition of membership is pretty clearly defined as follows: —

Article I. Therefore, *the Christian Churches of the Unitarian Faith here assembled,* unite themselves in a common body to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches, to the end of energizing and stimulating the

denomination with which they are connected to the largest exertions in the cause of Christian faith and work.

ART. II. This National Conference shall be composed of such delegates, elected once in two years, not exceeding three from any church, including its minister, who shall officially be one, as *any of our churches* may accredit to it by a certificate of their appointment.

ART. III. The American Unitarian Association, the Western Conference, and such other theological, academic, or humane organizations *in our body* as the Conference may see fit to invite, shall be entitled to representation by not more than three delegates each.

These are the only provisions in regard to membership. "*The Christian Churches of the Unitarian Faith*" unite in the Conference; which shall be composed of delegates accredited by "*any of* OUR *churches*," or by certain organizations "*in* OUR *body*." We confess that we should have expected, if there were any criticism upon it, that instead of its being a fear that the Constitution would admit a society of Chinese Idolaters, it would rather be charged upon the Conference that it falsely assumed in its name an appearance of broad inclusiveness, by calling itself the "Conference of Unitarian and *other Christian* Churches," when there is no provision whatever for the admission of any but those distinctly Unitarian.

Of course, Mr. Metcalf would say the point is that this new article declares all the rest to be meaningless. This has been many times affirmed to be the effect of this amendment. If so, then indeed it would be an absurdity, and a stultification. But we think it is no such thing, and that its purpose is just what we have above described and nothing more. We know very little of Constitutional Law, except the fact that it is meant to be based on the principles of common sense; and our belief is that common sense would teach that no construction of an instru-

ment would be considered sound that would at once annihilate the organization it is meant to control. "We know that whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law." And so this article, and all the articles in the Constitution of the Conference, are addressed to those only who are included as members of the body to which the Constitution is affixed.

We must end here, so far as the pages of the Journal are concerned, this discussion. Our interest in the National Conference, both individually and officially, centres in what is declared in its first article to be its leading purpose; viz., to "energize and stimulate the denomination with which it is connected in the cause of Christian faith and work." We believe it has already, in this direction, more than justified the expectation of its founders. And our own work in it, and discussion upon it, shall be to help its usefulness and efficiency, in this its great purpose, as much as we can.

DISCUSSION OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

[At the request of the Council of the National Conference, we print the entire debate at the recent meeting of the Conference, in New York, on the amendment to its Constitution. The following report contains as nearly as possible *every word* that was spoken in the course of the discussion. It is believed that such a report will serve better than any thing else to correct any misrepresentations that may have been given, and to make known the spirit and action of the Conference, and the exact intention of the amendment as passed.]

ADDRESS OF JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

I HOLD in my hand a resolution which I have been requested to offer, and which has been assigned for consideration this morning. This resolution passed regularly through the Business

Committee, and has come, therefore, legitimately before the Conference now. Before reading it, I should like to make a few remarks on the general subject.

When the Preamble to the Constitution was adopted in this city, I took no part personally in its arrangement, but I supported it. I believed in something of the kind being adopted as the basis of this Conference; I believe in it still; I should not, for one, consent to have it altered essentially; I should not wish to have it altered at all. Not that I care particularly about the phraseology; not that it seems to me a matter of any very great or essential consequence what form of words we use; not that it seems to me we should adhere pertinaciously to one form of words rather than another. There are some advantages in changing a form of expression, because otherwise the form will, in the course of time, kill the spirit. The letter kills the spirit sometimes, and sometimes the best way in which the spirit of a thing can be maintained alive is by letting it take a new form. The providence of God shows us that. Every thing that lives must have a body as well as soul, but in the providence of God it is arranged that the body, after a while, shall pass away, and the soul be incorporated in some new form. So it is in all this outer world; so it is in the world of thought and life. Nevertheless, I should be very sorry if we should tamper, at this time, with the Preamble to our Constitution. We adopted it deliberately, and it is not worth while to change it; and therefore I am glad that the gentlemen who have felt aggrieved by the terms of this Preamble do not ask of us to-day to touch it in any way, but merely to add an explanatory statement, which will relieve them from some real or supposed difficulties in regard to it.

And I am glad, also, to find, by this resolution which has come into my hands, after having been submitted to those gentlemen, our friends and brothers, who have found it difficult to act with us conscientiously, although desiring to act with us and become a part of our body, — I am glad to find, that what can satisfy them is essentially a statement which we have already made, which we have already cheerfully and unanimously adopted, with a very slight addition, which seems to me to be

entirely in the tone and spirit of our faith and of our accepted principles. We have always, as Unitarians, from the first, opposed creeds; and it would be, I think, suicidal if at this time of day we should give up the fundamental and legitimate opposition to creeds, which we have always made a part of the object of our Association. But at the same time, while opposing creeds, we have never meant to oppose the word "creed," but some bad thing in the creed. We have never at any time said, for example, that it was not proper for men to have a definite belief. On the contrary, we have always thought that it was right for every man to have his own *credo*, his own belief, his own creed, and the more definite it is, the better it is. The more definite a man can make his creed, the better; and we have never maintained that it was wrong for two men, thinking the same way, to agree together in stating that they hold this common opinion. If it is right for one man to believe a thing, it is right for two to believe the same thing, or a hundred to believe the same thing, and right for them to say that they believe it, — not only right for them to say it, but wrong for them *not* to say it. We owe it to truth to say what we believe, and if we can unite on any definite expression of opinion, it is a good thing to do it.

What, then, have we opposed in creeds? So far as I now know, after a frequent and careful consideration of the subject, there are only three evils connected with creeds which we have opposed. The first evil we have opposed in a creed is, when the creed is made a condition of fellowship; when men say, "You must express your faith in a certain form of words, or we will not work with you or sympathize with you as Christian brethren." Creeds in that sense have been the bane of the Church. They have torn it into fragments; and for every creed which has been accepted in this world as the foundation of union, there have been ge erally two new sects. In that sense, making the acceptance of a creed the condition of fellowship, we have always opposed it. That is one of the evils of creeds.

The sec nd evi of creeds has been when they have been made the test of character. A man puts his own conviction in a certain form of words; at least, he cannot see how his conviction can be expressed in another form of words; and so he

says, "If a man does not say that he has my conviction, as my conviction is the source of all the good there is in me, as all my love for God and man is rooted in my conviction, I cannot see how he can love God as I do, unless he has that conviction." In that sense, creeds have been made the test of Christianity, and they have been the source of the largest amount of the persecution that has ever taken place in the world.

The third evil of creeds has been, that they have built up a barrier against progress. When men have said a certain thing in the best way they can think of saying it, they do not like to be shaken out of their old habit of thought and statement. So creeds have been set up as the terminus, beyond which there is no thought, — the *ultima thule* of thought.

It seems to me these are the three evils of creeds, and I do not see any more.

Now, when we laid down this preamble, was it or not a creed in any or all of these senses? If not, no harm done! Call it a creed if you choose, there is no harm in it, if it is not made a creed in either of these senses.

Was it made a condition of fellowship? Certainly not. On the contrary, we passed a resolution saying explicitly that it only represented the opinion of the majority, and that the minority were not bound by it. Nevertheless, the majority welcomed them to our Convention, and rejoiced in having them as co-workers. It was not, then, made a condition of fellowship.

Was it made a test of Christianity? Far less. There is not a man who has spoken on this preamble who has not taken pains to express his love for the Christian character and nobleness and truthfulness of those who did not subscribe to it. It has never been made a test of Christianity.

Has it been made a bar to progress? Not at all; since at any time this Convention can, by a vote of two-thirds of the delegates, take away any part of the preamble. There is a limitation to it. Therefore it seems to me it is not objectionable in any of the senses in which we have ever complained of creeds as objectionable.

Then, I ask, is there any use in it? — for it is not enough that it should be unobjectionable: it must be of some use. To my

mind, it is of the greatest use, and, I suppose, to the minds of a majority of the Convention who adopted it. It is to me a matter of the utmost importance that in some way or other (I do not care in what way) we should designate ourselves deliberately as a Christian body; as a body who believe in Jesus Christ. We do not want to cut ourselves off from connection with Jesus Christ and the great body of believers. The Unitarians have from the first consented to be recognized as nothing less than Christians, and it has been one of our complaints against other churches, that they have said, that because we did not accept their statements concerning Christ, we were therefore not Christians. But, more than that, it is not a question of reputation or a question of position. To me, and to a large part of this body, as I believe, it is a question of life; of personal religious and ecclesiastical life. To me, speaking individually, — and I speak as the representative of a large body, probably a majority, of the persons who adopted the preamble, — to me, Jesus Christ is my mediator, — a mediator between me and the Father. To me, not only was he a mediator centuries ago, but he lives to-day, is with us here to-day, and with all who are in his spirit, and through him, by maintaining that connection with him, we are branches, living branches, of the Tree of Life.

I do not want to preach, but I say, in just so many words (and I do not know but I have expressed it sufficiently), that we cannot do without some loyal, open, positive declaration of faith in Jesus Christ.

As regards these phrases, I will not say I am indifferent: I will say I am not positive. The word "Lord" has been objected to. If any other word can be found which will express the idea, I am perfectly willing to accept it. I have endeavored to enter into the minds of our friends who have objected to that phrase, and I think I can understand some of the grounds of objection. I know it can be used in a bad sense as well as a good sense, and it has been. For example, we can say that Jesus is our Master, and that whatever he is represented as saying in the New Testament we are to accept, though it goes against our conscience and reason. Now, not one of us would

accept the phrase in that sense; but there is a possible construction of it, by which we bring in our reason and power of judgment to compare this and that thing. When, therefore, we say Jesus is our Lord, what we mean is, that Jesus has power to teach divine truth; that he came full of truth; that we cannot do without his truth; that wherever he spoke, his words were fragrant and redolent and alive with that truth; and that we must find out as well as we can by our reason, conscience, and Christian experience, and the Christian experience of the universal Church, what it was he meant; and when we find that out, then we have got something solid to rest upon.

Now, it is very possible for the phrase to be misunderstood, and, on account of that possible misunderstanding, I suppose, Jesus said, "Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth; but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you." We have got from him that which we see to be true, and that is what our friends will accept on the other side. When they get from Christ what they see to be true, they receive it gladly, cheerfully, and are thankful to him for it; and we can receive nothing else but what we see to be true. There is, therefore, ground, more or less good, for objection to that phrase. I do not object to it, because I think the sense is intelligible enough in which it is accepted, and therefore I should be sorry to have it changed. I can think of nothing else that would express my idea.

So of the other phrase. When I read of "the kingdom of his Son" in the preamble, I understand by that the kingdom of God's truth and love in this world. I understand that Jesus spoke sometimes of his kingdom, and sometimes of his Father's kingdom, interchangeably. He did not hold himself fast to either phrase. In our daily prayer, we do not say, "May Christ's kingdom come;" but we say, "May thy kingdom come." I do not know but that is an objectionable phrase; nevertheless, I shall be very sorry to see any thing altered in the preamble, because I think it would seem that we had given up something which we do not mean to give up; and therefore I thank our friends for not asking us to alter this preamble in any particular.

They are perfectly willing it should stand as it is. They do not want any alteration: they only want an explanation. And what they want is this: they want the following amendment to the constitution, as the ninth article: —

ART. 9. To secure the largest unity of the Spirit and the widest practical co-operation, it is hereby declared that all expressions in this Preamble and Constitution are expressions only of a majority of the Conference, committing in no degree those who object to them, and depending for their effect upon the consent they command on their own merits from the churches here represented or belonging within the circle of our fellowship.

I cordially assent to that. I should be glad to have that made fundamental in the constitution, because it is what we all believe, and what we all say. Then there is this additional sentence: —

"And that we heartily welcome to that fellowship all who desire to work with us in advancing the kingdom of God."

That also has been already done. We have heartily welcomed to our fellowship "all who desire to advance the kingdom of God." Therefore I should be ready, if it can be done, to have that amendment of the constitution passed to-day. But I confess I see some practical difficulties. The constitution says that it shall not be amended "except by a vote of two-thirds of the accredited delegates," &c. I foresee that we shall have a good deal of difficulty in finding out who are the accredited delegates.

The PRESIDENT. — If there is no point made upon it, there will be no trouble.

REMARKS OF REV. ROBERT COLLYER.

I very gladly rise to second the resolution that has been offered for the adoption of this article. Our dear good friend, Mr. May, of Syracuse, who is kept at home by sickness, desired earnestly to do this, and if he could have been with us, would have done it this morning; and he wished, as he could not, that I, if it was convenient and right, should do it for him. I would gladly do it, also, as a thing personal to myself, and something that I want to do.

I suppose it is not a secret to most of the Convention that I

voted, at the first and second Conventions of our body at New York and Syracuse, against the preamble to our constitution; and I voted against it for this reason, that while I trust I would not give way to any man in my loyalty and allegiance to that great person I love to call "Jesus Christ our Lord," I do not want any convention to insist that I shall hold this allegiance, and then explain, define, and settle it for me. I want to be left free in that particular, because I feel it is one of the most essential things in my Christian life. If any convention of American citizens should get up a preamble to the constitution, and before they would admit that I should be called a loyal American, should insist that in a certain clearly defined sense, which they themselves had settled, I should say that I believed in Grant, who is the great captain of American salvation at this time, I should want to tell them that they had better let the definition alone; that I could believe in Grant with all my heart and soul and mind and strength, and in a military sense, and in other senses, could very well accept him as the captain of our salvation.

Now, I feel something like that in this matter of accepting Jesus Christ. He is the Captain of my salvation, — I am not ashamed here or anywhere else to say that, — my spiritual leader and guide. When I gave up my relation to the Methodist Church, I never thought for a moment of giving up my relation to Christ; and when somebody said, "Have you not given up his divinity?" I said, "No; but I have taken up his humanity." Now, that remains so to this day. I feel it in my deepest heart as I make these remarks this morning. It seems to me that the adoption of the proposed article would do away for ever with any desire on my part to vote down this preamble to the constitution. It would leave it exactly as I should like to see it, — leave us all as free as we want to be or ought to be; and I think it would allay for ever this irritation, this feeling that pervades many of the body, and that we might all be united and dwell together in unity, with one soul. It has been intimated in plain terms, that if this article can be adopted, it will do away with this feeling, and give a great many men an opportunity to work with our body that they would not find otherwise.

We all have our different definitions of the life and character and spirit of Jesus Christ, and, in their way, I have no doubt that others feel as great a loyalty, as great a reverence, as deep a devotion, to this life and character and spirit as we do; and I most earnestly desire, for one, to see every one of these men intimately united to this whole body of Christians; and then I will tell you what will be the result.

I knew a man who, about eighteen years ago, left a monarchy, and came to live in a republic. When he came to this country (for this was where he came), he felt a little disturbed in his mind about the authority of the new government under which he had come to live. The thing was not clear to him at all. He did not know that he could give up his allegiance to Queen Victoria, that he could take on allegiance to the man who happened to be President then, and swear to be a true and loyal member of the republic of which he had become virtually a member. The republic let him alone. It invited him to tea; it held out its hand to him; it shook hands heartily, and made him feel, that whatever he felt about the republic, the republic felt all right about him, and that he might stay here and have all the advantages and all the good he could possibly get out of the relation, without swearing out or swearing in. It let this question of the definition of his loyalty to the republic alone, and so the thing stood for seven years. At the end of that time, the man began to say, "Now, it seems to me, that I can go a little deeper as an American citizen than I have gone up to this time;" and so he went to the court-house and swore out, and then he went and swore in; and so he became finally, by simply living among Republicans, by simply being with them and acting with them, as good a Republican as if he had been born here and brought up with all the traditions of the country tingling in every vein of his body. And he will give place to no man to-day in his loyalty to the American Republic, while still he feels the old love for the mother country, and for the noble woman who is queen of that country also.

This is what is coming if we open our hearts wide and our doors wide. Do not draw bars and bolts of definition against the entrance of those ingenuous souls who want to come in and

live with us. If they differ from us now, in the course of time they will become, in every respect, so entirely of our spirit, that while they may still have their own opinions, — and God forbid that they should not have their own opinions! — while they may have their own convictions, — and we are the last men in the world to hinder them from having their own convictions, or giving the fullest and freest expression to them, — we shall find that they are with us in spirit, and, in many things, willing to go further than we are ourselves. We are now inviting them to come and take a place in our convention, and be with us in the great and noble work which God has opened before the liberal Christian body in this country.

REV. MR. HALE'S ADDRESS.

I rise to support the amendment, most heartily and cordially. I hold, as a matter of constitutional law, that that is the constitution of the Convention, historically, already. I do not care to go into the history of this matter now; at another time I will do so, perhaps. I will simply say, that what I call the great Catholic plank of the constitution of this Conference was introduced by and for the conservative wing of our body; that it secured the presence with us of the conservative wing of our body; and now, if it happens that that plank answers the purpose of the radical wing, it seems to me that we ought, in manliness and Christian courage, to see that it is embodied in the platform. When it states, "that we heartily welcome to our fellowship all who desire to work with us in advancing the kingdom of God," it merely states the simple truth at the bottom of the heart of every religious man; it simply says what I say, and what I suppose every clergyman here says, on communion Sunday, that while his own church is ready to celebrate the communion, he invites all who hear him to unite in that celebration, if they desire to do so, and can do so, in acknowledgment and interpretation of the character of Jesus Christ. We offer that same fellowship here to those who are willing to work with us, "in advancing the kingdom of God."

I am often reminded of the test of my venerable friend, Dr. Wayland, the President of Brown University. When one and

another sectarian asked him if this man was a Christian, or that man was a Christian, Dr. Wayland always said, "Do they stand the Master's test? Can they cast out the devils?" Our friends come here to us and say that they want to cast out the devils. They say they do not feel certain that they can cast out the devils alone, but that they want to work with us in casting out the devils, because we have got some methods of casting out the devils which they would like to join in and adhere to. For one, I regard that overture of theirs precisely as I regard the overtures of gallant Hungarians, Frenchmen, Poles, and Germans to join our army. If they were willing to fight under my banner, if they were willing to fight with my leader, if they were willing to fight with us, I asked no questions as to their interpretation of banner, leader, or cause. I gave them the right hand of fellowship.

I have always supposed that these were the principles of our Unitarian body; certainly I have supposed that they were the principles of this body; I suppose they are its principles now. Should any gentleman ask me if I think the new article adds to the constitution word or tittle, I should say, No. I should say, that I thought that, historically, fairly, the very words printed here are in that constitution already. It is because I think so that I vote for it now. I am the last man in this Convention, I think, to have any desire to cut off the Unitarian Association from the Church of Christ. It is because this body votes itself, considers itself, declares itself, an integral member of the great body of Christ, that I am with it, and am standing here. It is because these gentlemen wish to work with us under that declaration, under that preamble and constitution, — to work with the "National Conference of Unitarians and other Christian churches," — that I offer them my hearty fellowship, as in my own church, as I have said, I offer the right hand of fellowship to any who will come in and work with us there.

Last night, when I was asked by the gentlemen who had agreed to this amendment, if I would move its adoption, I declined, because, as I have said, I regarded it as already in the constitution, historically; but I said I should certainly favor it, if it came up. When I left the hall, I took occasion to take

counsel of some of the most conservative men I knew in this body, to see if their impressions agreed with mine; and I need not say that I was pleased to find that, without exception, they did. And yet I will not say that I permit myself ever to be governed by the advice of other gentlemen, however highly I respect them; and, as we are among friends, I will say that in this matter, I went to higher authority; I went to the authority to which I always go, and which I am proud to recognize as the authority which I follow when I can find its direction; and, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus to the young scribe who had given his view of the first commandment and the second commandment in the Law, — remembering how he said to him, "Thou art yet far from the kingdom of God," and yet offered him the right hand of fellowship, — I felt that I had no right to refuse mine to men who were at least in that same position. The fellowship is predicated on the "desire to work with us." The friends whom I have around me here well know that I, for one, shall construe that statement with great strictness. I shall expect to see this faith shown in works. So far as I am concerned, I shall expect to hear very little talking, and to see a great deal of working, in any relation we have with them. It will be for these friends hereafter to determine what working with us may mean; but certainly the desire to work with us seems to me to come within all of the Master's requisitions.

ADDRESS BY REV. MR. CALTHROP.

There seems to be such a noble unanimity in this great body of delegates, that all I desire to say is simply this, in all candor and honesty: I will allow myself, for this moment, to stand as the representative of those gentlemen who agreed to this amendment, and I say on behalf of every one of them, that they do not want to speak a word. No other word shall we utter, no complaint will we make, provided this is carried. I feel that the less I say, the better, in this matter, because my heart has been so touched with the nobleness of these three speeches that I have heard. Why need we further witness? I simply state this for the information of any delegates who may be ignorant of the fact, that the gentlemen who consulted upon this matter

simply took the resolve, which was the actual call, the trumpet call to the churches to assemble here at the first Conference; took it word for word, save and except the words that were required to explain the present situation. Half the strength of this resolution would have satisfied us, because that had already been offered and unanimously carried. For that reason alone was this ninth article put in so strong a form. Gentlemen, it is a splendid opportunity. The Father and Lord of men, and Him whom I delight to know as the great Head of the Church, looks down in benediction upon our return to perfect peace and brotherhood to-day.

ADDRESS BY REV. DR. OSGOOD.

The spirit of what has been said seems to me to be most admirable, and it is sure to prevail; that is, the spirit, whatever may be the result, with regard to certain ideas connected with that spirit. We have followed a very simple course in the organization of our Convention. When we came together, this preamble was introduced. I had nothing to do with it, and was not particularly fond of the phraseology, though I liked the idea; and when the matter was debated, I took this ground, that the idea of the preamble we did not make: we simply found it. It is the root from which our denomination originally grew; the spiritual authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. And when the question came up, "Does this exclude those who are called the more liberal community in our body?" — I took occasion to say, that I thought not; that we stated precisely what we were; that we declared our *status* as brethren; and so we continued on our denominational platform. That was the position taken here at the first meeting, and at Syracuse the same idea was carried out. It was stated, in words essentially like the first part of this amendment, that there was to be no attempt to coerce the individual conscience; that the old Christian liberty was to be retained. That seems to me to be enough. I do not see any particular reason for making any additional statement. But if an additional statement, which shall be true to our understanding, will place the body in a better position, I am for it; and I have put in three words here, which will

make this article of the constitution congenial with my thought, and, I should think, with the judgment of the Convention. I would propose an amendment, putting in these words: "In Christian faith." It will then read thus: "And that we heartily welcome to that fellowship all who, in Christian faith, desire to work with us in advancing the kingdom of God."

That is the ground on which I would stand: that as a "Conference of Unitarian and other Christian churches," we are Christians; we stand on that ground, and we welcome to our fellowship all who, as Christians, will work with us. We are very ready to do what good we can to other persons, if they accept our ministrations and join in our charities; but as a "Conference of Unitarian and other Christian churches," our belief is the Christian faith, and not general Theism or Free Religion. It is very well to be amiable, to be broad, to go for the largest liberty; but the liberty that I advocate is the liberty wherewith Jesus Christ hath made us free.

Now, if the question be as to liberty of thinking, I would take very broad ground. It seems to me that we are not free in our thinking; that we are losing our position as a liberal Christian body, of large theological views. We are running on in certain ruts. The great thinkers of Christendom have had very little fellowship with much of our recent thought. We want a deeper philosophy, a profounder criticism. We want a larger fellowship with the highest thought of the present day, a deep sense of the revelations of science, — not that miserable science that in its naturalism would virtually say that the world made God, instead of the Christian doctrine, that God made the world, but a science that affirms itself Hebraistic as well as Hellenistic, and which is following, in divine order, the divine laws.

In our body we have very important elements that are sometimes antagonistic. Let us be broad enough to take in all the elements. Now, this young blood, it does not need patronizing, and it is strong enough to affirm itself. We want it; we want all the young blood in our body; and instead of asking these young men to be what is called "fogyish," I would say, let them be bolder, and soar on a broader wing, and rise upon a nobler pinion toward the eternal Fountain of Truth. There is a great

deal of that which is called liberalism, which shows itself in insanely trying to sever the connection between the present and the past, which scorns history, which would make it out that our liberty consists in freedom from restraint; that we came by a kind of spontaneous generation of our own will, instead of being the children of the past. I do not call that wisdom, — it seems to me utter puerility; and there is a great deal of the thought that is set forth as being the uncommon thought of our time, which is not liberalism, which is the merest superstition, a revival of the old Oriental follies. Give us Christian liberty in all good directions, liberty to go forward, and liberty also to hold to our denominational root.

I think that we should see to what things tend. Now, here is the point: Are we a body on the basis of free religion in general, and, having adopted this platform of Christian loyalty, do we say it does not amount to any thing, that, as a body, we are not bound by it, and we will take in all who are willing to work with us, under a vague kind of Theism, or are we unmistakably Christians? That is the point. There is a great deal of thinking and acting that comes in the form of work for the kingdom of God that is utterly unsound. Free Religion is sometimes carried to Free Love. I am told that in one of the leading organs of the Free-Religious movement there have recently been two assaults on the ordinance of marriage. We do not want that. We want to go to the real principle. We want to have it unmistakably understood whether we stand on the Christian platform as a Conference of Churches, or whether we are out-of-doors in Free Religion.

That is my position. I do not know that anybody thinks as I do in this matter, but I move that amendment in the spirit of the largest liberty and fellowship with all Christians, and with good-will to all persons who are unwilling to say that they can work in the Christian faith, but who are willing to work generally for the kingdom of God. For Christ and for his Church I give my vote here to-day, and as a member of his Church, I can have no affinity with anybody who stands on a platform more lax than that.

REV. DR. BELLOWS' ADDRESS.

I never rose to perform a more painful duty than I now rise to perform. If I can judge truly of the minds of this Conference, and of its intentions, by observing the thoughts of those who have spoken before me, and the general direction in which they have agreed, and the heartiness of the assent that has been given to those opinions (I refer to the opinions of the three gentlemen who spoke first), I incline to think that this is perhaps the last time I shall have the pleasure of addressing my Unitarian brethren. Much as I love them, I have not the least idea of being put constructively out of the Christian Church, or of being in the least degree compromised in my own position and attitude in respect to a positive faith in Christianity, by any action of this Convention. I want to meet this matter flat-footed, and deal, not with words, but with things.

I have too much respect for the gentlemen who have brought in this amendment not to believe that they know what they mean; and I have too much respect for them to believe that they wish us to mix this matter up in any rosewater mush of unmeaning concessions. We want the plain facts before us; and then when this Convention is prepared to act in full view of the plain facts, when it knows just what it is going to do, and does it, in the face and eyes of the facts and of the consequences, certainly, if it shall decide to pass this amendment, or any thing like this amendment, or to put any gloss upon our preamble, or to throw open this Convention any more broadly, emphatically, and distinctly than the preamble throws it open, I for one should feel it incumbent upon my respect for the Convention, my love of peace in the Convention, my desire to leave the Convention to its own will and its own path, and not to be a thorn in its side, an entering wedge of division, a perpetual protest against its wishes and desires — to go on my solitary way, asking nobody to go with me, but going where my duty to my Master and my Lord Jesus Christ calls me.

I beg that nobody will suppose that I think so much hangs upon what I think or do or say, that these words are to be regarded in the least as a threat or challenge. God knows that I

have no such meaning in my mind. I say it with profound solemnity, from a profound sense of duty, from the profound conviction in my mind that this body is placing itself, in the eyes of the Christian world, upon the side of infidelity. I do not say it means to do it; I do not say there is a man here, on either side, who means to do it; and if you do do it, I do not believe you will do it meaning to do it, or thinking you are going to do it; but it is because I am persuaded that you are doing it, that you are opening the flood-gates of infidelity, that you are saying it is of no consequence whether a man believes in the personal authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, or no, that it is of no consequence whether we have a historical Church or no, that it is of no consequence whether we believe, individually and personally, or collectively, in the guidance and direction of the Lord Jesus Christ or no, — it is because I believe this that I say these words.

This is no new question, dear brethren. It is a question that has come up in the Church again and again; and those who have taken the side that you are now called upon to take, have rued most bitterly the consequences. What does Priestley say, in his history of that period of the Christian Church between 1688 and 1802? And here I stop to pay a tribute of profound respect to that scholar, philosopher, and sweet saint, whom it is the custom in America, and I confess it has been too much my custom, to describe as a vague, as an unsound, as an unserious divine; at any rate, as a most unwise and unsagacious spirit. I believe that in his own day and time, there was not a nobler man on the planet, or a braver or more heroic Christian; and I honor him, saint as he was, from the bottom of my heart.

"In the mean time," he says, in his history, "an attempt was made by the enemies of Christianity to substitute in the place of Christian worship one of simple deism, and the government proved it by allowing the *Theophilanpisti*, as they called themselves, the use of the churches. An attempt of the same kind had been made in London some years before, and a scheme of the same nature had been proposed by Voltaire. But it appeared from all these schemes, and from this in France as well as the others, that where there is no belief or revealed religion, there will be no zeal for any sufficient to keep up any form of worship.

These societies, favored as they were, sunk gradually into neglect and contempt."

Brethren, we have precisely the same state of things over again. The science, the materialistic philosophy of the world, in our age and time, are all striving to crush Christianity out of sight. They are teaching us that there is no supernatural authority for the gospel of Jesus Christ. They would have us believe that that is something that is absolutely impossible. They "pooh-pooh" the whole evidences of historical Christianity. I do not claim to be a great scholar, nor a person who has devoted his life to a critical examination of these authorities; but I have common sense, and I have applied that to a careful study of this question; and if I know any thing, I know this, that the people who talk about the weakness of the evidences of Christianity, are generally persons who never looked into them; and I believe, from the bottom of my heart, that Christianity will outlast, in its historical name and title, the name and fame of every person, whatever he may be, who has ventured to denounce or dispute it. I bind myself to faith in the gospel of Jesus Christ; and, furthermore, I am a churchman. I believe in a historic Church which has descended from Jesus Christ; and it is because I see a secret design to undermine that Church, to make light of that Church, to distract attention from that Church, that I oppose this change in our preamble. That, if I know any thing, I know to be the secret *animus* of most of those who are opposed to the preamble to the constitution of this Convention, and I believe they are men honest enough to say so. They do not want us to deceive ourselves into the belief that they are in substantial agreement with us. I say, let them stand with us. Heaven forbid that we should push one out, shut our doors against them, or change any thing in that generous preamble, which was adopted for the sake of giving them shelter. It was not merely for the sake of sheltering the conservative side, as Brother Hale said. I drew it up, and I know it was meant to give shelter and protection to both sides. That preamble is wide enough —

At this point, the president rapped, to notify the speaker that his ten minutes had been exhausted. A motion was made for an

extension of the time, but Dr. Bellows refused to go on, saying that he had spoken his whole mind, and he could not make it more plain if he talked a month.

Rev. ROBERT COLLIER. — I would inquire if the amendment was seconded?

The PRESIDENT. — It was not.

Rev. A. D. MAYO. — I second it.

REMARKS OF REV. MR. HEYWOOD.

We all feel the significance and solemnity of this occasion. Let me say, in the first place, that I am heartily in favor of the amendment of Dr. Osgood, and hope it will prevail; but whether it prevails or not, I hope the amendment to the preamble proposed by Dr. Clarke will be adopted. And for these reasons: Yesterday morning, when you, Mr. President, made your introductory remarks, I listened with exceeding interest to them, and my interest was very closely attracted by what you said in reference to the good old sacred history of Abram. In alluding to him, "the father of the faithful," and "the faithful one," you spoke of Lot as having left him, and expressed the hope that, as Abram went after Lot to bring him back, so there would be a spirit in this great Convention that would lead us to go after any Lot that there might be who had been inclined to leave us. Last evening, sitting in the solitude of my room, I thought I would look again at the beautiful story of the "father of the faithful;" and I found that Lot left Abram because there was a difference between his herdsmen and Abram's herdsmen, and not because there was a difference between himself and Abram at all. I found, moreover, that when the good old father, whose faith makes his name stand out as the name bright and luminous through all time, for his simple trust in the Father of us all, — I found that when he went after Lot, who had left him when he so generously gave him permission to go whichever way he chose, he went after him because poor Lot had got into terrible difficulty; he had fallen into the hands of the Philistines. He had looked towards the plains of Sodom, then a fair and beautiful land to the eye, and had gone there, and cast in his lot with the people there. Then came in Chedorlaomer and Tidal, and

those other kings with unpronounceable names, and took the goods of Sodom, and Lot was taken captive and carried off. Then it was, when Lot was in the midst of captivity and trouble, that the good and venerable man went after him, and brought him to himself, and brought him to the dear faith that he had not had before; not altering one iota of that faith, not changing any preamble at all, but bringing him to it. Mr. President, Lot remained with him awhile, and then retired, and fell into still greater difficulty than before; but that does not matter particularly with reference to the point before us.

Sir, I have been trying to think if there was any way in which this National Conference, representing Abram, could go after those friends who, for one reason or another, have seen fit to separate from us in this great work; and I confess I did not see any way, for it appears to me that for a Christian body to hesitate in any measure in regard to expressing, in preamble and in constitution, in Church life and in all their being, their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as their Master, is one of those strange paradoxes that may exist (and we know they do exist), but how they exist almost surpasses our power of thinking. Therefore, I did not see how I could lower at all that standard, in order to bring any wandering Lot back to the fold; and therefore, sir, with my poor limited vision, I apprehended (which I dreaded with all my soul) that we might have discord and separation. But, sir, when I came into the house this morning and heard that amendment, then the thought came to my mind, "Why, Abram, during the last two conferences, went out after Lot, with this declaration, that we, in whatever we do, only bind the majority." He went with that declaration twice, at least, in order to give Lot an opportunity to come back, and Lot did not see fit to come back; and now the Conference, in its Abramic spirit, seems to desire a third time, and in more specific form, to offer that opportunity of returning; and therefore it seemed to me the way was opening in which we might preserve the integrity of the body, and avoid the painful duty of doing any thing that should seem to jar upon the tenderest conscience, the most sensitive feeling, of any earnest Christian inquirer.

Mr. President, our friends, in saying that they are willing to

accept this amendment, say that they come and take their places with us, as a Conference of Christian churches. Our preamble says that. It stands out in very bold words. All that is said in the constitution states or implies that we are a Conference of Christian churches; and if any come to unite with us in this Conference they pronounce themselves as being, and wishing to be regarded as, Christian churches. I cannot, therefore, look at this question in the light that Dr. Bellows does, whom I love with my whole heart, and for whom I have such profound reverence, that when he says a thing, and I see occasion to differ from him, I distrust my own judgment. This Conference, I say, upon the forefront, and written in letters of living light, declares itself a Conference of Christian churches, and when men desire to unite with us, they declare themselves as wishing to be regarded as Christians; and, sir, that being the case, shall we say to any, "Stand aloof"? Would our dear Lord and Master say that? Would St. Paul say that? I think not. I believe in the sincerity of these friends, I believe in their honesty; but I utterly differ from their philosophy. I do not believe there is any thing substantial in it; I have no sort of faith in this neology and this extreme rationalism, which would put Christ out of the New Testament and out of his Church; but I believe these friends, if they come in at all, will come in honestly, and I do think we should now open the door again, and, in the spirit of Abram say, "Now come in and work with us for the extension of the kingdom of God, and may you never return to Sodom!"

REMARKS OF D. L. SHOREY.

It will be remembered by all the delegates who were at the Conference at Syracuse, that this whole matter was discussed and decided with entire unanimity. It will be remembered that the gentleman who spoke next but one before me (Dr. Bellows) spoke his mind fully at that time, and gave his entire assent to the very substance of this amendment. I think I cannot be mistaken in this. Therefore I say that he must have got some new light since then, if he supposes that simply putting this amendment into the constitution (which was then, as before, declared to be the precise sense of the Conference) is going to

upset the Unitarian denomination, so that he will be obliged to secede from it. I say, it is patent that he must have got some new light since that time.

Now, what are the facts? This declaration has stood before the Unitarian body for three years, substantially as now; and I appeal to this Conference, representing the intelligence of the Unitarian body, I appeal to those who have known it the longest, and have worked in it most faithfully, I appeal to their moral sense and their conscience, — if there have been any three years in its history when there has been so much work done for Christ as there has been done in those three years. I appeal to the sense of this Conference if there have ever been two days in which that vital life has had better expression than it has had in these two days in this hall. Because it is now proposed to put into a more formal expression that which has been the understood sense of this body for three years, is there any reason to make this great disturbance about it? I say, No. I say, that inasmuch as this matter has been fairly and candidly and carefully considered by those representing both wings of this body (if we have two wings), I hope the Conference will adopt this amendment, just as it stands. For my part, I care nothing for preambles: I am content with the record that Unitarianism has made in this country, as a Christian body. I am content to work with it, in my humble way, as long as I live, without any preamble whatever. I am willing that Unitarianism should be left from year to year to state itself, and I will risk the result.

REMARKS OF REV. R. L. COLLIER.

I cannot in any wise understand how any Unitarian, with the historic antecedents of the body in this country, can possibly object, on any ground, to the putting of this article into the fundamental constitution of this body. When I took my neck from one dogmatic yoke, it was not for the singular purpose of putting it into another. When young ministers and members of other Christian denominations get tired of the limitations and restraints of the dogmatic churches, their poor sighing, grieving hearts would not turn toward any body of Christians that would refuse to commend the temper and indorse the sentiments of this article.

I dislike to say that I am a conservative, but certainly in my theology, certainly in my deepest convictions, certainly in the philosophic relation that my soul bears to God, certainly in the emphasis that I place upon the mediation of Christ, I am a conservative of the conservatives. But I cannot compel other men to be: I would not if I could. But, sir, the passing or refusing to pass this article will not change one iota the general convictions of any man in the denomination. I believe if my blessed Master were here to-day, he would say, as before when on earth: "Master," said John, "we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us." And Jesus said unto him, "*Forbid him not; for he that is not against us, is for us.*" I believe in my heart that these men are for God; and, whether or no, wittingly or unwittingly, they are for Christ and his Church. And I am frank to say to-day (not, however, representing my Church, not representing the Unitarian Christians of Chicago, but standing alone), if it is the temper of this body to refuse to insert this article into its fundamental law, they may consider me out; for I stand where I have always stood. I will consent that this body shall define my theology, but I demand that it shall not limit my liberty.

REMARKS BY REV. O. B. FROTHINGHAM.

Gentlemen, Friends, and Brethren, — I am sorry that this discussion came up. I was not privy to it, I had no purpose to raise it myself; I considered it entirely at rest. My only object now is to come, if possible, to some fair understanding. I wish to be entirely sincere, and if I seem to speak for myself more than I should, I beg you to understand that it is not in any vanity or conceit or feeling of self-importance, but only because my position is a little peculiar as regards these gentlemen who make this application this morning. I make no application. I do not ask to come in. I think I have just as much right to be here this morning, a gentleman and a man of honor, who, when he does a thing, must be presumed to do it sincerely and honorably, as any other gentleman who is here to-day; but I wish this thing should be distinctly understood from my point of view. I sympathize in great measure with what Dr. Bellows says. I

sympathize very cordially with what my Brother Collier has just said. I think I appreciate the whole ground, in its strength and weakness, and both in its strength and weakness I would like to say one word upon it.

When the National Conference first met in New York, I went there, like so many others, expecting a hospitable welcome. I thought I did not find it, and I have repented since of some bitter things I said at the time, in a moment of impulse and passion, which has long since passed away. I left the Conference. The next year, when the meeting was at Syracuse, I did not attend. My radical friends came to me and remonstrated. "Why don't you go and fight it out?" — "Fight it out! There is nothing to fight. I do not want to break down any man's windows and creep in from behind. These men do not want me there; and if they do not want me, I do not wish to be there." It was evident from the *animus* of that Conference that they wished to renew the works of the Unitarian Association as it had always been prosecuted; I was not prepared for that, and I stayed outside. Consequently, I did not go to Syracuse. I did not approve of the action of the radicals at Syracuse. I said so at the time, and I have repeatedly said so since. But at that Conference, as has been well and fairly stated this morning, it became distinctly understood that this preamble was not to be regarded as a bond or pledge, or any statement which was intended to fence in or fence out anybody, but was the voice of the majority, by no means binding on the minority who disagreed with it, which minority, as also the majority, were at perfect liberty to put their own construction upon its words. After that, I felt perfectly free to come into this "Conference of Unitarian and other Christian churches." Mine is a Christian church. We are represented here as a Christian church. We have two delegates here, chosen by us as a Christian church. I am here as the pastor of a Christian church. I am also President of the "Free Religious Association." I hope that my friends will pardon me if I did feel a little hurt this morning at some of their insinuations and hints about the "Free Religious Association." I started that Association, with a few others, not for the purpose of running in antagonism to the Uni-

tarian conscience, not for the purpose of starting any different train, running in an opposite direction; but understanding perfectly well from the remarks of the gentlemen who conducted that Conference, that they did not mean to undertake a certain work, we proposed to attempt to do it outside of that organization. Dr. Bellows, in his beautiful sermon of Tuesday evening, said, "We have a certain limited work to do: we are bound to do it; and if any gentlemen have a work to do outside, God speed them in it." I was one who thought there was work to be done outside, and I set myself to the task of doing that, through the Free Religious Association, by no means casting the least reflection upon this. That Association did not confine itself to a Christian position; it expressly said so; it was not in its nature to do it. It welcomed all people, honestly, devotedly, sincerely religious, who had religious purposes and ends, and loved religion in their hearts, and it would allow no other to come in. We have not the least idea of throwing open our doors and windows to everybody who may choose to come, whether he is religious, irreligious, or unreligious. It is a *religious* association, — purely distinctly, earnestly, devoutly that, — and it shall never be any thing else, so long as I have any thing to do with it. It does not run to dangerous paths. Its morality will stand as clear as any morality under the sun. The general officers of that Association may challenge a comparison with any gentlemen on the planet. For nobleness, uprightness, truthfulness, purity, devotedness, sincerity, I defy anybody to challenge them. Enough of that.

Then there came a time when it was necessary to form an association. I wrote a note to Dr. Bellows, in which I expressed my reasons for not being able to join this Conference. Said I, "It is not the preamble; it is no construction of the preamble; I do not care a straw about it. I consider myself a Christian; I consider my church a Christian church; but if, as president of an association, I choose to take a position outside of Christianity, for the sake of doing a certain work, that is no imputation upon my Christianity at all. I am at liberty to put my own interpretation upon the word 'Christian;' but so long as a gentleman, who is a man of honor, whose character as a man of honor nobody

questions, chooses to call himself a Christian, you are bound to admit that he is one." I said to Dr. Bellows, "I feel, on speculative grounds, perfectly at liberty to stand in that position; when I do not, I shall go out. But my quarrel is here, that this is a Conference for work, and its work, as a Conference, must be exclusively denominational. It is work for the building up of Unitarian parishes, settling Unitarian ministers, sending out Unitarian missionaries, spreading Unitarian literature. Now," I said, "I do not sympathize with that; I cannot. If I go into this Conference, I must pledge myself and society to use all our joint efforts to raise money for these purposes, and to throw our influence in that direction. I cannot do it. There are other things in which I am more interested, and I want all the money I can get for those things. I appreciate your object; it is an honorable, noble, good work; I love the men who are doing it: I respect them from the bottom of my soul; but it is not exactly the work I can pledge myself to do, and therefore I do not come into the Conference." That was perfectly plain; Dr. Bellows perfectly understood it. But now these gentlemen come up and say, "We are willing to do this work; we are doing it; we shall do it honestly;" and they say, "Why should you shut us out? This is only an admission, on your part, in so many words, of what you have already said." They come up and say, "We are Christians; our churches are Christian; we only want to come in and work with you. Why can you not allow us to come in?" Are they not true men? Are you not obliged to believe them when they say, "We pledge ourselves, in coming into this Conference, to work with the Conference. If we are in a minority, we will get you to do our work as far as we can; we will hold you to use only our proportion of the money to do our work; and if we become the majority, we shall expect you to do the same. We only ask that we shall have our proportion of the funds, as we will contribute our proportion of the funds." That is all; it is a perfectly simple thing.

Now, I do not ask this for myself. I do not say that I will do this work; I do not think I can. At any rate, until I feel that I can do that work, honestly and entirely, I shall not ask to be admitted into the Conference. When I do feel that I can do the work, I shall feel free to come in.

Personally, therefore, I have no interest in this matter at all. As President of the Free Religious Association, I have an interest; for, if this resolution is rejected, these young men will probably fall into the compass, somehow or other, of that Association. If this resolution is accepted, you will have them in your own body, working with you. I say, it is a good work to do. Let every man decide in his own mind whether he can do that work or not. If any man says he can, I do not see, gentlemen, how you can shut him out, unless you can cast some imputation upon his personal honor, and say that in sincerity and truth he cannot do this. I think you will not venture to say that of any of these gentlemen. I know them personally. I know they are men of their word, and I am anxious simply that I should not be committed with them, — not for my sake, but theirs. If I am a *bête noir*, I do not wish any of my shadow to fall upon them.

REMARKS OF REV. C. E. GRINNELL.

Mr. President and Friends, — I take the liberty, notwithstanding my youth, to speak to you to-day, because my venerable brother, Dr. Osgood, has said we need young blood; that young blood may do us good; and I also remember that St. Paul told us to "let no man despise our youth;" and since I know that Dr. Osgood does not despise his young brethren, I hope none of you will despise me.

It seems to be taken for granted, by some, that most of the young blood is on the radical side, and in favor of the proposed amendment. I would have you understand that all the young blood is not on that side, but I would also have you understand, that whether the young blood is on one side or the other, the young blood goes together. I would have you understand that the young men, whether they be conservative or radical, who come from Cambridge Divinity School (which was so well defended by my venerable father in God, Dr. Lothrop), those young men go together. Those young men are going together to defend Christianity.

Permit me to say, that I suppose some light may be thrown on our discussion by considering the Scriptures. You remember

that after our Lord rose from the dead, he appeared to some of the disciples. You remember that Thomas doubted that he had appeared. What did the disciples who had seen him do? Did they say, "We know he rose from the dead; we saw him after he had risen, and unless you believe it, we will annoy you in every possible way; we will cast you out of the room, and forbid you to pray with us"? No: they said, "Come again, and if you look, perhaps you will see him." If they had turned away Thomas, how do we know that our Lord would not have gone to him, and convinced him, instead of going to the disciples who were already convinced? What is the good of a body of Christian disciples, if they are going to hold themselves aloof from others? They will never convert anybody.

You remember another instance, after the Lord ascended into heaven. Peter was friendly to the Gentiles, but you remember that when some Jews from Jerusalem came to Antioch, — Christian Jews, respectable Jews, excellent Jews, but still *Jews*, — Peter, who was associating with the Gentiles whom he had been teaching Christianity, felt perplexed. Perhaps they were more interested in something else; perhaps they were theists; but Paul came there, who had seen the Lord, and when he saw Peter desert his brethren, because of the Jews, he "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."

It seems to me that one can speak not immodestly, even in the presence of those who are his elders, when he feels that he speaks, not from his own self, but as a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ. You remember that in one of his parables, the kingdom of heaven is likened unto the leaven which a woman took and *hid* in three measures of meal. Now, I have that confidence in the leaven of Christianity, that I believe that, even if it is hid in three measures of meal, it will leaven the meal; but if you take it away, or forbid its being put into the meal, what will the leaven be? Nothing but a lump of sour stuff!

We read that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." I think, if we are going to save the world, we must go into the world; we must work with the world; and even if some of our brethren predict that by and by there

will be danger, I say, I will take the risk. The way to be a Christian is to be brave, to be bold. Why, Mr. President, that is what our Orthodox friends say of us. A few months ago, a very liberal Orthodox man said to me, "I would go into the Unitarian body, if I was not afraid of becoming too radical after I got there." I said, "Don't be afraid: try it!" Suppose the Unitarians had never come out from the Orthodox body, we should never have known how strong the kingdom of Christ is, how comprehensive the kingdom of God is, who sent Him into the world, and how strong charity is, as we do to-day. If anybody says there is danger, ten years from now, of our becoming theists, I say, I will take the risk. I do not believe in it. I believe that the leaven of Christianity will convert everybody in the world, and that the Son will be the King, until he bows to the Father who made him.

Now, let us be confident and brave, and let us believe that men who are not far from the kingdom of God are not devils. They are looking into the face of Christ. Perhaps they do not understand him; but do not their faces shine? Do they not shine more than the faces of those who turn away from Him, although they may have hold of the Lord's hand?

REMARKS OF REV. DR. LOTHROP.

I am sorry that there is such an "old fogy" to come after the young blood whose address you have just heard with so much satisfaction. I listened with great interest to Brother Grinnell's Scriptural illustrations, but for the life of me, I cannot tell on which side of this question he places himself. I agree that his illustration was very good about the apostles and Thomas, but what we seem to be called upon to do to-day is to have the apostles give up to Thomas, and say the Lord *did not rise* because he don't believe it! That is the position in which this Convention is placed.

If this preamble means nothing, as gentlemen say, what is the use of passing it? If it does mean any thing, what does it mean? It means, that, after all, that preamble, and the expression, "the Lord Jesus Christ," do not mean any thing in our opinion, and therefore this Convention recedes from that posi-

tion. Now, that young blood that we delighted to hear just now, referred to Scripture a good deal. I recollect a passage of Scripture where the Master says, "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am." That, I believe, is the true Christian platform, — for the human mind to go to Jesus Christ and his instructions, as of divine authority, and the highest authority the human mind can have in this world. That is the foundation of the Christian Church; and if this Conference means to be, and continue to be, a Conference of Christian churches, it must stand upon that platform. At any rate, as I said yesterday, Brother Frothingham is still here, and has a right to be here. He can interpret that expression as he chooses, — we need not make a declaration of what it means to him, — and every other man can interpret it as he chooses. Why, then, should we make a declaration that paralyzes the phrase, that takes all force from it, in order to satisfy him and his friends? Why should we not continue to stand where, after the most deliberate and serious consideration, we placed ourselves three years ago? And if any man wants to stand on another platform, and have a "Free Religious Association," let him go and have it. But if there is not room enough under that expression, "to establish the kingdom of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ," for every man to work for the glory of God and the good of men in this world, I should like to know it. I should like to know if, in his "Free Religious Association," Brother Frothingham can do any thing more for the good of man than in his Christian Church and in this Conference.

I see no reason, therefore, for the adoption of this ninth article. I shall vote for Brother Osgood's amendment, because, whenever a proposition is under consideration in a deliberative assembly, I feel bound to perfect it as far as I can, if it shall pass; but I shall vote against the whole proposition. I see no reason why we should pass it. I do not believe that with our present preamble and constitution, we infringe one iota the liberty of any man who has any right to call himself a Christian. I do not consider that the Roman Catholics interfere with my liberty at all. I do not consider that the Orthodox churches of New England have ever interfered with my liberty at all. I

am perfectly willing that they should have their organizations and go on with them, — the Catholics, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, and the rest. They are nothing to me. They do not interfere with me. Let them all have room. I belong to this body of Unitarians, who have always, from the beginning to the end, rested upon Christ and the New Testament as the revelation of the mind and will of God to men for their salvation. That, I will venture to say, is the idea that pervades nineteen-twentieths of our churches. That is the platform upon which we have stood, and why should we depart from it? We have adopted it in the broadest and most catholic manner possible, and why should we explain away its meaning, in order to let some brethren who do not like that expression, "the Lord Jesus Christ," come in and work with us? Let them come in at any rate, and they can interpret that phrase as they choose.

Now, if it is possible for the radical party (I use that term because it is the most expressive), if it is possible for the ministers and laymen, or anybody else who stands in the position of Brother Frothingham, to work for the Church, to establish religious institutions, to make those institutions and principles and ideas a power in the Christian world, I want them to do it; but I want them to do it on their own hook, and not carrying with them all the prestige, all the traditions, all the memories, all the holy influences that have come down to us, and gather round the name of the Unitarian Church of America.

That is my position. I should like to see them go forward, and if I belonged to them, I would go out from the Unitarian body, I would take my position upon the principles and ideas which I believed to be true; and in the name of God and humanity, I would go to work behind those ideas, and if I could have power and success in the world, very well. That is the thing they ought to do, and not come here and insist that this body, called together on a different principle, receiving different traditions, pervaded in all ways by different influences, should stultify itself by so interpreting the preamble that it adopted three years ago, that it shall mean nothing.

REMARKS OF REV. J. W. CHADWICK.

I do not stand here thinking that I can add one word of argument in favor of this article, just as it stands, but only to add one more voice and one more prayer to the voices and prayers that have been already uttered, that it may be incorporated in the organic law of this body. And, first of all, I want to protest against the hint that is thrown out on almost every side, that the desire for its adoption is the desire of young men only. There are men who have spoken here this morning, who are no longer young, whose whole hearts and souls cry out for this thing. There are men and women in every society whose whole hearts and souls cry out for this thing. There are men who are not here — like that dear saint, Dr. Bartol, for whom prayers should go up to-day like incense to Almighty God — whose hearts and souls cry out for this thing. You know it is so. It is not simply earnest young men, but earnest men, both young and old, and women, both old and young.

It seems to me it is a very simple question. First, it seems to me to be a question whether this body will keep the original faith with which it started, or whether it will confess that it set a trap, and having got us into it, we may get out of it the best way we can; for at the time we went into the Convention in this city three years ago, the very thing which we ask you to agree to to-day was agreed to, and we should never have come into this Conference if it had not been for that agreement. The more radical portion of that Convention would have gone out of it in less than one hour after it assembled, if it had not agreed that its action should be binding only upon a majority. The question now is, whether you will keep that faith; that faith which underlies the Constitution of this Conference even as the Declaration of Independence underlies the Constitution of the United States. I know there are men who scout the Declaration of Independence, who speak of it as a collection of "glittering generalities," and so you may speak of the resolution which underlies your constitution as a "glittering generality," but no man of honor and good faith will do either.

The other question seems to me to be, whether this Conference will make itself as broad as Unitarianism and as broad as Christianity. If it chooses to make itself small and little, it is out of its power to make Unitarianism as small as itself, to make Christianity as small as itself. They would still lie outside of it, and welcome all earnest, faithful, and obedient souls to their encircling, all-embracing fold. I was born into the Unitarian Church, and cannot be turned out of it, or die out of it; I was born into the Christian Church, and cannot be turned out of it. And I will allow no man to dispute my right to be as good a Unitarian, and, in the historical sense, as good a Christian, as he. I deny that we are cutting ourselves off from the historical roots of our faith. No, friends: we would strike down our roots into the historical soil further and further, until they shall take hold of the very centres of the universe, until they shall twine themselves about the very throne of God.

I ask you, then, to pass this preamble, for the sake of your own honor, and for the love of those who would hate to leave you, just as it stands, not even inserting the amendment which Dr. Osgood has suggested. For though my faith is the Christian faith, though I am a Christian and a Unitarian, still, I would not ask any man to accept my creed; and as a creed, I would as soon swallow the whole of the Westminster Catechism as any one single word that could be offered me. A creed is a creed, be it little or much, and however it may have been with regard to the Jewish law, certainly it is true of the perfect law of liberty, that he who sins against it in the least, sins against it in all.

REMARKS OF HON. T. M. EDWARDS.

I am here as a delegate from the State Unitarian Association of New Hampshire, and I feel an interest in the question now before this Convention, and desire that it shall, if possible, be so settled that it shall result in entire harmony, that we may go home and report to our constituencies that we are a united body; that we are not rent by factions so diverse that there can be no compromise; that the English language does not afford any terms under which we can all harmonize and act together.

I am not learned in theological subtleties, and I shall take,

in the few remarks I shall make, a very common-sense view of this matter. I understand that the action of the Convention is to be first upon the amendment proposed by Dr. Osgood, to interpolate into the new article the three words, "in Christian faith." Sir, I have observed the temper of this body, and I think I do not mistake in saying that there is no question about the passage of the resolution itself, with or without the amendment. It is consistent with the liberality which we have always claimed for the order, to throw our doors open to the widest possible extent that we can consistently with the maintenance of true religious doctrines, of whatever order or class they may be. I am not surprised that this concession has been made to the gentlemen who have asked it, for it seems to me to be perfectly consistent with the general feeling of the Unitarian body throughout the country; and I speak now not for the clergy, but for the people. I know the sentiments of the people of my own neighborhood, and I know they do not differ from the sentiments of the people in other parts of the State. It was said by Dr. Osgood, that if these three words were inserted, he should heartily consent to the adoption of the article, — and I speak of him not merely as an individual, but as the representative man of a portion of the Convention. It was not said by the last gentleman who spoke in favor of letting the platform stand as adopted at Syracuse, that he should oppose this article at all events. He said he should not vote for it, but he did not enter any protest against it, as if its adoption would be the occasion of his withdrawal; and I hope, if these words are accepted they will enable us to retain as the head, almost, of our order, at least I may say, as one of the most honored men of our order, the gentleman who has said that he should feel himself under the necessity of withdrawing from this association if the article was adopted without those words. I rise for peace and harmony, and I appeal to gentlemen to accept that proposition, and thus secure a harmonious result. It seems to me there can be no real objection to the insertion of those three words. We do not undertake to define what "Christian faith" is. It only requires that whoever proposes to act with us shall come somewhere within the broad lines of Christian faith, and not be entirely outside. Every

gentleman who has spoken has said that he claims to be a Christian, and to be within the lines of the Christian faith, and therefore, if it will conduce to harmony, if it will enable us to separate with good feelings towards each other, I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and then that the article will be unanimously adopted.

REMARKS OF REV. A. D. MAYO.

I claim the right to be heard on this question. I seconded the motion of Dr. Osgood to insert the words, "in Christian faith," because I want to know exactly what we are doing to-day. When I came to the Convention that was held in the city of New York more than three years ago, I came with the desire, that the Unitarian churches of this country, which had for so many years been scattered, been found in hostility often to each other, might be brought together in some available bond of action. I had not the slightest objection to the formation of any form of religious association whatever; I had not the slightest objection to becoming a member of any society for the promotion of reform, without any Christian designation whatever; but I did want that the Unitarian churches of this country should be bound together in some bond wherein they could work to carry forward our glorious old Unitarian faith; and I was willing that every man should give the largest interpretation to Unitarianism and Christianity, to suit himself. I was one of the committee that formed this preamble. There were two opinions in that committee. Mr. William Henry Channing, who was a member of that committee, desired that we should form another kind of association; that is, an association from which the limitations of Unitarianism and Christianity should be left out, so that all classes of men who believed in God could come in and join with us, in doing moral, philanthropic, and truly good work. But the prevailing sentiment of that committee and of the Convention was, that however proper such a general association might be, that was a body of men met to form a Unitarian and Christian association. We all recognized that there were two risks which beset any Convention that Unitarians might form. In the first place, we confined ourselves strictly to Unitarian

churches. We said, "If we conclude to let in other Christian churches, the Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists may, if they choose, come in and swamp us, — make us a Christian organization, and not a Unitarian organization." But, last year, we concluded to run that risk. In other words, we concluded, if the Catholics of this city, the Episcopalians, or the Presbyterians, chose to come in here or send their delegates to vote us down, and make it some other kind of Christian Convention, they could do so; we were willing to run that risk. Being all Christians, and knowing what Christianity has done in this world, we are willing to run the risk of being swamped by the Christianity of these United States.

There is another risk, and that is just what this proposition to amend the proposed article is intended to meet. The original resolution means this, and nothing more: that we are willing to run the risk of having everybody in this country, that calls itself a religious body, send its delegates here, and, if they can get a majority (as Mr. Frothingham has plainly said), abolish Unitarianism, and Christianity along with it, and turn this into the same thing that the Free Religious Association is. That is the risk we run. That is precisely the thing you are doing.

Now, friends, I am not willing to run that risk. I do not say that I shall leave this body if, next year, the Jews choose to come in here and vote us down and make us a Hebrew association, or if the Spiritualists (they call themselves a religious body) choose to come in and vote us down. If any body, calling itself a religious association, comes in and votes us down, I do not say I am going to leave this body. I belong to a great many bodies that are not Christian, not Unitarian. I belong to the Republican party; but I want, as a Unitarian Christian, an organization that I can work in; and I am willing to be swamped by Christianity, for Unitarianism means Christianity; but I am not willing to be swamped by Judaism, by Spiritualism, by any thing that is willing to call itself "religious."

Last year, I had the pleasure of crossing the Atlantic for the first time. I went in a magnificent steamer, but on the way over, I saw a great many sailing craft, of every kind, I suppose, that was ever invented; some of them finer than my own, some

of them poorer than my own; some, wretched old scows, — so old, that I wondered how they could keep afloat; and yet I would not say that in an emergency I would not be willing to cross the Atlantic in one of those boats, because every one was afloat, every one had buoyed somebody on the Atlantic, every one had proved itself in days gone by. But if any man had come to me and said, "Throw yourself into the wide sea that roars all around you, and trust to your power of swimming to reach the shore," I should have said, "No: I prefer not to run that risk. When a boy, I did once swim across a mill-pond, but it very nearly sunk me. I cannot tell that, in ages to come, men may not be able to swim across the Atlantic, but I am not ready to trust myself to it to-day." So I am not willing to trust myself to-day to the great Atlantic Ocean of all men's speculations, to every thing that chooses to call itself "religious," in this or any other country, feeling that there is no surety that I and the cause I represent will reach the shore.

Mr. J. M. Mitchell, of Bridgewater, moved the previous question.

Rev. E. E. Hale requested Mr. Mitchell to withdraw the motion, stating that he would renew it as soon as he had offerred a resolution, and Mr. M. consented.

Mr. Hale. — I am informed by gentlemen who think they represent widely different ranges of opinion, that a large majority of this Convention will probably agree to re-assert the original resolution which I read yesterday at the close of the report of the Council, and which I said was agreed upon by everybody. As things now stand, that resolution is not on the published records of the Convention, it having been, as was truly said just now, the Declaration of Independence previous to the adoption of the Constitution. I am intrusted with a proposition to re-assert this Declaration of Independence, with the single substitution of the words "preamble and constitution" for the words "Resolution and Declaration of Independence of the Conference."

Resolved, That to secure the largest unity of the spirit, and the widest practical co-operation, it is hereby understood that all declarations of this Conference, including the preamble and constitution, are expressions only of its majority, committing in no degree those who object to them, and

dependent wholly for their effect upon the consent they command on their own merits from the churches here represented or belonging within the circle of our fellowship.

Dr. OSGOOD. — I will accept that.

Mr. CALTHROP. — That will be perfectly satisfactory to me, and I trust it will be satisfactory to all whom I incidentally represent.

Mr. HALE. — I understand this to be perfectly satisfactory to Dr. Bellows.

Dr. BELLOWS. — Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. — I offer that as an amendment to Dr. Clarke's article.

Dr. CLARKE. — I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. COLLYER. — I want to ask a single question: What becomes of the last clause in Mr. Clarke's article: "and that we heartily welcome to that fellowship all who desire to work with us in advancing the kingdom of God"?

Mr. HALE. — That is withdrawn.

Dr. BELLOWS. — If this motion is to be debated, I wish to give notice that I shall demand of the Conference the fullest opportunity of meeting the question before it is concluded. If it is not debated, for one, I shall accept it as a compromise or agreement between the two parties in this body.

Mr. HALE. — It is due to every gentleman I have consulted, to say, that this is proposed as an article to be adopted without debate. The Conference is simply asked to re-assert an article which, by direction of the Council, I said was the unanimous opinion of this body.

Dr. LOTHROP. — I move that the question be taken by yeas and nays.

Dr. OSGOOD. — It is not necessary. The motion will be carried.

Dr. LOTHROP. — I know it, but I want a record of the vote.

After a few remarks by Rev. Henry W. Foote, of Boston, in favor of allowing the fullest opportunity for debate, if it took a month, the question was put, and the amendment carried, by a vote of 326 to 12.

LETTER FROM BISHOP PAYNE.

[In connection with this letter, and in order to explain it, we would state that one of the methods agreed upon by which the American Unitarian Association co-operates with the African Methodist Episcopal Church is this: Wilberforce University, of which Bishop Payne is President, and which is the leading educational institution of that denomination, is within easy reach of Antioch College; and arrangements have been made by which, at the expense of our Association, the professors of Antioch College shall give a certain amount of instruction regularly in Wilberforce University. — Ed.]

Wilberforce University,
Near Xenia, Green County, Ohio,
Nov. 6, 1868.

Rev. Charles Lowe, — Your favor of the 13th ultimo was duly received, and would have been immediately acknowledged; but inasmuch as I was not present last year, to witness the series of lectures then delivered, I thought I would wait, and attend two or three, so as to have some knowledge of the style of the lectures as well as the subject-matter.

Of which I have both the happiness and honor to say, —

That this day week, President Hosmer and Professor Orton came to Wilberforce University. The former prefaced the course by very appropriate but brief remarks; the latter gave an introduction to a course of twelve lectures on Theology, which was very impressive. On Wednesday of this week, he returned, and delivered the second, which deepened the interest created by the first, and made both teachers and students feel that God has sent you to confer incalculable blessings upon our institution, and through it upon the race.

Professor Anthony came this afternoon, and gave his first lecture of a course on "Mechanics." It was excellent, and was an illustration of the weight of bodies, — perhaps I had rather said of the laws of gravity, — laws of gravity! Is not gravity itself a law?

But I am philosophizing. I must stop, and thank you, thank our good Brother Hale, thank all our Unitarian friends, who are to us more than brothers, for their noble, unselfish charity, — charity like that which Christ himself has manifested. We are

the man the Jew robbed, bruised, bleeding, fainting on the open roadside; the Priest, the Levite, passing by, both looking on, pitying, hastening away. *You* are the good Samaritan. God the Father bless you for it; God the Son bless you for it; God the Holy Spirit bless you for it. I speak as a Trinitarian; you will allow me that liberty. I know you only as a Christian brother. Let us both love Jesus, obey Jesus; and when we meet him in heaven, he will tell us who took the right view of himself, the Father, and the Spirit.

Fraternally, PAYNE.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Scott's Poetical Works. Boston: Fields & Osgood.

This is another of the "Diamond Series," and contains the entire poetry of Scott, in one little volume.

The Flower and the Star, and other Stories for Children. Written and illustrated by W. J. LINTON. Boston: Fields & Osgood.

The Testimony of Ninety Years. In memory of Jacob Newman Knapp. Cambridge: Press of John Wilson & Son.

This beautifully printed pamphlet contains the commemorative sermon preached by Rev. Dr. Bellows, shortly after the death of Mr. Knapp, and a notice prepared for the "Monthly Religious Magazine" by Rev. Dr. Thomas Hill. Together they make a fit record of a deeply interesting and lovely life. — ED.

Twenty-five Sermons. By JOHN CORDNER, Minister of the Church of the Messiah, Montreal.

This volume was prepared on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Mr. Cordner's settlement as pastor of that society. The sermons are upon a great variety of topics; and in their wide range, and in their clear, practical, and earnestly religious tone, we find the secret of that influence of the author, in which we have all so cordially rejoiced. A few copies of the volume may be obtained at the rooms of this Association. — ED.

"HAVE WE MISREPRESENTED ORTHODOXY?"

THE article under the above title, in the October number of this Journal, has been printed in a pamphlet form, in accordance with the request of many, and may be obtained free of cost, on application at the rooms of the Association. It is proper to say, that, since it appeared, many confirmations of its statements have been received, showing that we there very much understated, as we intended to do, both the severity of the doctrines and their prevalence. We give two specimens of what we have recived.

I. The following extracts are from a set of "Doctrine Tickets," used now in the Orthodox Sunday school of the town from which our copy was sent: —

All Men are born Sinners.

'Tis not when men to manhood grow,
That sinners they become;
But, by their parents' guilt, mankind
Are sinners from the womb.

Psal. li. 5; John iii. 6.

Every duty is so imperfectly performed, as to be in itself displeasing to God.

The Lord is holy; and his law
Is so exceeding broad,
That every act of duty done,
Displeasing is to God.

Job. xv. 14–16; Prov. xxi. 2; John vi. 44.

II. The following questions and answers are taken from "A Short Catechism for Young Children," by John Brown, published in Philadelphia. In the year 1864, this Catechism was used and committed to memory by every pupil, adult and infant, in the Sunday school connected with a prominent Orthodox Congregational Church in Eastern Massachusetts, whose pastor was a graduate from Andover.

Q. *Does your wicked heart make all your thoughts, words, and actions sinful?*

A. Yes: I do nothing but sin.

Q. *Is your life very short, frail, and uncertain?*

A. Yes: perhaps I may die the next moment.

Q. *What will become of you, if you die in your sins?*

A. I must go to hell with the wicked.

Q. *How many kinds of sin are there?*

A. Two.

Q. *What are these two kinds?*

A. Original and actual.

Q. *What is original sin?*

A. It is that sin in which I was conceived and born.

Q. *Doth original sin wholly defile you, and is it sufficient to send you to hell, though you had no other sin?*

A. Yes.

Q. *What are you then by nature?*

A. I am an enemy to God, a child of Satan, and an heir of hell.

Q. *Cannot your good thoughts, words, or actions, recover you by the covenant of works?*

A. No: every thing I do is sinful.

Q. *Can God pardon your sin without a satisfaction to his justice?*

A. No: he will by no means clear the guilty.

Q. *Why could none but Christ satisfy for your sin?*

A. Because none but he could bear infinite wrath.

Q. *How long will the wicked continue in hell, and the saints in heaven?*

A. For ever and ever.

Q. *What will the wicked for ever do in hell?*

A. They will roar, curse and blaspheme God.

Q. *What will the righteous for ever do in heaven?*

A. They will behold the glory and sing the praises of God in Christ.

Q. *What is the prayer of the wicked in God's account?*

A. It is an abomination to the Lord.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

We earnestly request that in every society, the pastor (or, where there is no pastor, the parish committee) will, before the close of the present month, *ascertain and report to us the number of copies of the Journal that are desired for the coming year.*

We must ask that some pains be taken to comply with this request. We wish to avoid unnecessary expense in sending more copies than are actually distributed and read.

Let us also suggest, that sometimes the attention of the people be called to the Journal. Its purpose is to promote a wider acquaintance and sympathy with the work and interests of the denomination, and it will be greatly aided in this purpose by an occasional word from the minister.

The "Year-Book" will take the place of the January number; and we would ask our brethren to communicate to us at once any information that may be necessary to its completeness.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Nov. 9, 1868. — Present: Messrs. Smith, Cudworth, Hepworth, Livermore, Metcalf, Reynolds, Ware, Crosby, Kennard, Lyman, Fox, and Lowe.

The Committee on Publications reported that books had been granted, in response to applications received, to the Free Public Library in Watertown, Mass., and the Library of the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

They also reported that there had been received from the Committee appointed by the National Conference, to confer with this Board upon the subject, a plan for the proposed denominational Review. They had preferred to submit this plan to the full Board, and had, therefore, proposed a meeting of conference with this Committee on the following Wednesday; and they recommended that, when the Board adjourned, they adjourn to meet on that day, at three o'clock P.M.

This Committee also reported in favor of an appropriation for the purpose of issuing a new tract by William Everett, Esq.; and an edition, in pamphlet form, of an article printed in the October number of the "Monthly Journal," entitled "Have we misrepresented Orthodoxy?"

The report of this Committee was adopted.

The Committee on the New-England States presented a report, in which the following appropriations were recommended, which were voted: $500 in aid of the society in Hyde Park, Mass., for the year beginning Nov. 1, 1868; $75 to Rev. William H. Fish, for services as Secretary of the Plymouth and Bay Conference, and as missionary within its limits, in accordance with the recommendation of the officers of that Conference; $150 to the society in Tyngsboro', Mass., for the year beginning Nov. 1, 1868, conditioned on their maintaining services regularly, and settling a permanent pastor as soon as practicable; $100 to the society in Warwick, Mass.; and $200 to Mr. W. A. P. Willard, for the year beginning whenever he should assume the pastoral charge of the Warwick society, in consideration of missionary services to be rendered by him under the direction of the New-England Committee, and on condition that any amounts he might receive for such service should be credited to the Association.

The Committee on the Middle and Southern States submitted reports from Miss Amy M. Bradley, of her work in Wilmington, N.C.; from Rev. D. H. Clark, of missionary work in Central New York; and from Rev. H. C. Dugan, in New Jersey.

The Committee on the Western States submitted reports from Rev. C. H. Brigham, Rev. J. L. Douthit, and Rev. John Ellis, and recommended appropriations as follows, which were voted: $100 to the society in Kansas City, Mo., towards the expenses of procuring candidates for settlement; $100 to the society in Indianapolis, Ind., for the same purpose; $1,000 to the Indianapolis society, to be paid on condition of their securing a permanent pastor, and on such further conditions as might seem expedient to the Western-States Committee of this Board; and $500 for purposes of general missionary work in the West.

The Committee on Theological Education recommended that, in accordance with the request of the Professors of the Cambridge Divinity School, the sum of $50 should be appropriated to each of the following students in that institution: Edwin A. Pratt, Edwin S. Elder, Edward Crowninshield, Robert McLeod, David P. Muzzey, John F. Locke, and Flavius J. McMillan.

The Committee on Foreign Missions reported concerning the action taken by the National Conference, in regard to the establishment of Unitarian preaching, in the English language, at Paris, and asked for authority to take immediate steps for carrying out the proposed plan; which authority was granted.

The Secretary presented a communication received from the Secretary of the Sunday-school Society, announcing the action of that society at its recent annual meeting, in relation to the Association; and it was decided, in view of the lateness of the hour, to defer the consideration of the subject until the December meeting of the Board; but, to provide for the present urgent need of the society for funds, an appropriation was made for its benefit of $500.

After the transaction of other business, the Board adjourned.

Nov. 11. — The Board met, in accordance with the vote adopted at the last meeting, at three o'clock P.M.

There were present, Messrs. Smith, Cudworth, Livermore, Metcalf, Osgood, Reynolds, Ware, Crosby, Lyman, Fox, and Lowe.

The Secretary laid before the Board a communication from Central Committee on Theatre Preaching, appointed by the National Conference. That Committee represented that the work proposed was so large that it could not be left to volunteers, and they therefore requested the Executive Committee of this Association to co-operate with them in carrying out the plans proposed.

In response to this request, the following resolution was adopted by the Board: —

Resolved, That the sum of $3,000 be appropriated for the support of theatre preaching, after the plan proposed at the National Conference, and partially matured by the Committee appointed by the Conference for that purpose; and that the details of the expenditure be referred to a Committee of three of this Board, with full power to arrange the work, in connection with the Committee of the National Conference; the understanding being that the sum paid by the Association shall only be for the compensation and expenses of the preacher and agents.

Messrs. Ware, Cudworth, and Lowe were then appointed to serve as this Committee.

The subject of the new Review was then taken up, and the gentlemen appointed to confer with the Board — Rev. Dr. Osgood and Rev. J. H. Allen, as the Committee appointed by the National Conference, and Rev. Dr. Bellows and Rev. E. E. Hale as a Committee of the Council — appeared, and stated their views in regard to the matter.

The subject was then discussed at length, but no action was taken; the Board (while fully persuaded of the great advantage to our cause of a Review, such as was contemplated) being unable so far to approve of the particular plans suggested, as to feel authorized to appropriate the amount of pecuniary aid that would be required to start the enterprise. They were also of the opinion that no plan could receive their approval which involved the relinquishment by the Association of its "Monthly Journal."

The Board then adjourned.

INTELLIGENCE.

The Connecticut Valley Conference held a meeting at Deerfield, Mass., commencing on Tuesday evening, Oct. 27, and continuing through the following day. A sermon was preached Tuesday evening, by Rev. Charles Noyes, of Northfield, which was followed by remarks from Rev. Charles A. Humphreys, of Springfield, Rev. John F. Moors, of Greenfield, and Rev. Crawford Nightingale, of Groton Junction.

Wednesday morning, there was a meeting for conference and prayer, conducted by Rev. Stilman Barber, of Bernardston; after which the regular sessions of the Conference commenced, Hon. George Walker, of Springfield, the President, occupying the chair. An essay was read by Rev. Calvin Stebbins, of Chicopee, on "The Importance of a Doctrinal Belief;" which was followed by a discussion, in which Rev. Edgar Buckingham, of Deerfield, Rev. William L. Jenkins, of Northampton, and others, took part.

At the afternoon session, Rev. William G. Scandlin, Secretary of the Worcester Conference, who was expected to speak on the organizations for work in that Conference, being absent on account of illness, Rev. Edwin G. Adams, of Templeton, one of its Directors, was invited to take his place. His address was followed by remarks from Rev. Charles Noyes, Rev. Calvin Stebbins, Rev. Charles A. Humphreys, and Rev. Charles A. Allen, of Montpelier, Vt., Secretary of the Champlain Conference; after which the Conference adjourned.

The Champlain Liberal Christian Conference held a meeting in Burlington, Vt., commencing on Thursday evening, Oct. 29, with a sermon by Rev. H. R. Nye (Universalist), of Springfield, and continuing through the following day.

At the sessions on Friday, officers were chosen for the ensuing year: the Constitution was modified so that the Conference should hereafter be composed, not of clergy and the delegates of churches, but of all individuals who should contribute a dollar annually to its treasury; reports were offered of the missionary operations of the Conference; and plans adopted for the more systematic furtherance of those operations.

A discussion upon co-operation among Liberal Christian denominations was opened with an address by Rev. Warren Skinner (Universalist), of Waterbury, Vt., and was continued by remarks from Rev. Charles Lowe, Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, Dr. Charles Woodhouse, of Rutland, and others. An essay on "Pastoral Work" was then read by Rev. S. A. Parker (Universalist), of Bethel, Vt., which was followed by a discussion, and the Conference then adjourned.

THE EAST CHURCH in Salem, Mass., celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, on Sunday, Nov. 8. In the forenoon, there was an historical address from Judge Joseph G. Waters, a member of the society; the devotional exercises being conducted by the pastor, Rev. Samuel C. Beane, and Rev. Richard M. Hodges, of Cambridge. In the evening, a discourse was delivered by the pastor on "The Religious History of New England during the last century and a half."

THE NEW CHURCH erected by the society in Laconia, N.H., was dedicated on Wednesday, Nov. 11. The sermon was preached by Rev. William R. Alger, of Boston; the other exercises being conducted by Rev. James De Normandie, of Portsmouth, N.H., Rev. Joseph F. Lovering, of Concord, N.H., and other clergymen.

THE NEW YORK AND HUDSON RIVER CONFERENCE held a meeting at Troy, N.Y., beginning on Tuesday evening, Nov. 17, and continuing through the following day. A sermon was preached Tuesday evening, by Rev. Alfred P. Putnam, of Brooklyn, N.Y., on "The Threefold Testimony of St. Paul;" which was followed by short addresses from Rev. Rushton D. Burr, of Yonkers, N.Y., Rev. A. N. Adams (Universalist), of Fairhaven, Vt., and others.

Wednesday morning, after a devotional meeting of an hour, conducted by Rev. Newton M. Mann, of Troy, the session of the Conference commenced, and Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D., of New York, the President, delivered an address. This was followed by the report of the Secretary, Rev. W. R. G. Mellen, and the remainder of the forenoon was devoted to reports from the different churches connected with the Conference.

At the afternoon session, an address was delivered by Rev. Rushton D. Burr, on "Christian Co-operation;" which was followed by a discussion. After the transaction of business, including the election of the following list of officers for the coming year, the Conference adjourned: President, Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D., of New York; Vice-Presidents, John E. Williams, of New York, and Rev. Alfred P. Putnam, of Brooklyn; Secre-

tary, Rev. W. R. G. Mellen, of Flushing; Treasurer, George Cabot Ward, of New York; Directors, Rev. Frederic A. Farley, D.D., of Brooklyn, Rev. Rushton D. Burr, of Yonkers, R. M. Field, of New York, George W. Jewett, of Staten Island, and Jackson S. Schultz, of New York.

The church of the society in Westford, Mass., having been removed and remodelled, was re-dedicated on Wednesday, Nov. 18. The order of services was as follows: Opening prayer, by Rev. Edward A. Horton, of Leominster; reading from the Scriptures, by Rev. Charles E. Grinnell, of Lowell; sermon, by the pastor, Rev. George H. Young; dedicatory prayer, by Rev. J. J. Twiss (Universalist), of Lowell; address to the people, by Rev. Fiske Barrett, of Chelmsford; benediction, by the pastor.

The Suffolk Conference held its annual meeting in the chapel of the Hollis-street Church, Boston, on Tuesday evening, Nov. 24.

Officers for the coming year were chosen as follows: President, Rev. James Freeman Clarke, D.D.; Vice-Presidents, George W. Bond, and Rev. George H. Hepworth; Secretary, Rev. George L. Chaney; Treasurer, Edward Wigglesworth; Directors, Rev. Edward E. Hale, William H. Baldwin, Rev. Samuel H. Winkley, William H. Kilby, Mrs. Samuel Cabot, and Mrs. Maybery.

A report was presented by the Board of Government of the doings of the Conference since its beginning.

The discussion of the evening turned upon theatre meetings, and it was voted to request the Board of Government to commence these meetings in the Boston Theatre as soon as possible.

Rev. J. Vila Blake has accepted a call from the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, Boston.

Rev. Charles W. Buck, formerly of Fall River, Mass., has accepted a call from the Second Unitarian Society, Portland, Me.

Rev. HORATIO WOOD has resigned his position as Minister-at-large in Lowell, Mass., after a service of twenty-four years.

Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY, D.D., will supply the pulpit of the First Independent Church, Baltimore, Md., during the winter.

Rev. DANIEL M. REED has consented to remain with the society in Rockford, Ill., as its pastor.

NEW UNITARIAN SOCIETIES have been organized in St. Louis, Mo., and in Chicago, and Roscoe, Ill.

Rev. HENRY BLANCHARD, of Brooklyn, N.Y., has accepted a call from the recently organized Unitarian Society in Indianapolis, Ind.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1868.			
Oct. 23.	From	Society in Sherborn, for "Monthly Journals," additional	$2.00
30.	„	Society in Montague	15.00
31.	„	Westminster Society, Providence, R.I., additional	364.00
Nov. 2.	„	Mrs. Jerome Jones, Boston	5.00
7.	„	Society in Concord, Mass.	355.15
9.	„	Mrs. A. G. Farwell, Boston, to make five persons life-members	150.00
11.	„	Ripley Ropes, New York, for India Mission, as amount pledged by him at National Conference	100.00
12.	„	Henry P. Kidder, Esq., Treasurer National Conference, the following sums pledged at the meeting in New York, for India Mission:—	
		Society in Northampton $25.00	
		„ „ Portsmouth, N.H. . . . 100.00	
		„ „ Groton 50.00	
		Arlington-street Society, Boston . 226.08	
		George Scarborough 50.00	
			451.08
16.	„	E. E. Bourne and wife, Kennebunk, Me., to make Elizabeth W. Hatch a life-member	30.00

MISSIONARY SUNDAY CONTRIBUTIONS.

The following sums have been received in response to the appeal made at the request of the National Conference. Many societies have not yet been heard from, either because the appointed Sunday being stormy, the collection was deferred; or because the money collected in the

church has been retained in order to increase the amount by subsequent subscription. It is hoped that all such societies will finish their work as soon as possible, that the complete list may be published, and the final result of the movement known.

Where the contribution in this list is supplementary to one made in response to the appeal of the Association in January last, the fact is indicated by placing immediately after the name of the society the amount then contributed.

Society in Marlboro'	$67.60
" " Danvers	25.43
Mt. Pleasant Society, Boston Highlands ($171.53)	131.91
Society in Pembroke	42.15
" " Lexington	73.85
" " Brunswick, Me.	15.00
" " Jamaica Plain ($511)	315.50
Hawes Place Society, South Boston ($115)	75.00
Society in Wilmington, Del.	37.13
" " Germantown, Penn. ($397)	131.06
" " Haverhill	11.95
" " South Natick	22.00
" " Winnetka, Ill.	30.00
" " Peabody ($330)	30.30
" " Newport, R.I.	224.00
" " Greenfield	100.00
" " Taunton	114.40
" " Ann Arbor, Mich.	57.52
" " Pepperell	38.00
" " Washington ($100)	40.00
" " Newton Corner ($735)	201.42
First Parish in Portland, Me. ($241.37)	113.00
Society in Chelsea	40.00
" " Beverly ($330.45)	44.55
" " Fitchburg ($301)	79.15
" " Fairhaven	70.00
" " Northboro'	50.00
" " Winchendon	52.00
North Society, Salem ($1,078.23)	169.45
Society in Lynnfield	13.00
" " Dover	6.26
" " North Easton	155.25
" " Neponset	32.00
" " West Newton	80.54
Third Religious Society, Dorchester ($132.10)	$56.00
Society in Sheboygan, Wis.	10.25
" " Buffalo, N.Y. ($800)	100.00
First Parish, Salem	201.45
Society in Sherborn	28.35
" " Waltham	100.00
" " Mendon	23.30
" " Grafton ($85.46)	62.85
" " East Marshfield	16.00
" " Janesville, Wis.	10.50
" " West Dedham	29.00
" " Billerica	70.00
" " Brookline	257.56
" " Brooklyn, Conn.	16.00
" " Eastport, Me.	35.80
" " Woburn	302.65
" " Marietta, Ohio	21.65
" " Castine, Me.	30.00
" " Louisville, Ky.	150.00
" " Stow	21.00
" " Northampton	100.00
" " Exeter, N.H.	35.00
" " East Bridgewater	29.00
" " Belfast, Me.	100.00
" " North Andover	112.00
" " Waterville, Me.	50.00
" " Nantucket ($63)	58.43
First Parish, Cambridge	500.00
Society in Somerville	100.00
" " Sharon	11.60
" " North Chelsea	15.71
" " Hampton Falls, N.H.	29.00
" " Keene, N.H. ($220)	50.00
" " East Saginaw, Mich.	6.46
" " Wilton, N.H.	21.85
" " Cleveland, Ohio	100.00
" " Sterling	84.00

The following sums have also been received, from persons connected with societies where no collection was taken, or residing where no Unitarian society exists: —

Mrs. Charles Cheney, Hartford, Conn.	$50.00
Friend in Portsmouth, N.H.	10.00
" " " "	2.00
Miss H. K. Webb	2.00
Friends in Belmont	50.00
Friends in Leicester	$61.00
J. S. Sewall, St. Paul, Minn.	20.00
A lady	5.00
"Andover"	2.00
A friend	2.00
John M. Williams, New Bedford	10.00